arXiv:gr-qc/0602021v1 7 Feb 2006

# The Barbero connection and its relation to the histories connection formalism without gauge fixing

Ntina Savvidou [*]
Theoretical Physics Group, Imperial College, SW7 2BZ, London, UK

February 7, 2008

**Abstract**

We present a histories version of the connection formalism of general relativity. Such an approach introduces a spacetime description—a characteristic feature of the histories approach—and we discuss the extent to which the usual loop variables are compatible with a spacetime description. In particular, we discuss the definability of the Barbero connection without any gauge fixing. Although it is not the pullback of a spacetime connection onto the three-surface and it does not have a natural spacetime interpretation, this does not mean that the Barbero connection is not suitable variable for quantisation; it appears naturally in the formalism even in absence of gauge fixing. It may be employed therefore, to define loop variables similar to those employed in loop quantum gravity. However, the loop algebra would have to be augmented by the introduction of additional variables.

## 1 Introduction

In this paper we study the connection formalism for general relativity within the context of the histories framework. This is a continuation of previous work on the histories description of general relativity, in terms of its geometrodynamic variables [1, 2]. The main motivation comes from the fact that the histories description provides a natural spacetime description of canonical general relativity and fully incorporates the fundamental principle of general covariance. The connection formalism provides the background for the quantisation in terms of the loop variables: it is thus the first step in an attempt to provide a histories quantisation scheme for gravity that follows the main idea of the loop quantum

---

[*] ntina@imperial.ac.uk

gravity programme, namely that the basic kinematical variables of the quantum theory have support on one-dimensional objects–loops or graphs. This scheme would combine the spacetime perspective and emphasis on general covariance of the histories framework with the technical facilities in the quantum treatment of the constraints, provided by the loop quantum gravity programme.

The basic object in the histories description is the notion of a history. This corresponds to the specification of information about the state of a physical system at different moments of time. It arises from the consistent histories approach to quantum theory developed by Griffiths [3], Omnés [4], Gell-Mann and Hartle [5, 6]. The specific version of the histories approach we describe here is known as the Histories Projection Operator (HPO) approach, which possesses two distinctive features. First, a history is a *temporally extended* object that it is represented quantum mechanically by a *single* projection operator on a suitably constructed Hilbert space [7, 8]. Second, the theory possesses a novel temporal structure, since time is implemented by *two distinct parameters*, one of which refers to the kinematical set-up of the theory, while the other refers solely to its dynamical behavior [9]. At the classical level the two parameters coincide for all histories that correspond to the solutions of the equations of motion.

The features above imply that the HPO theory is endowed with a rich kinematical structure. In the case of general relativity this results to the fact that the different 'canonical' descriptions of the theory, that correspond to different choices of spacelike foliation coexist in the space of histories and may be related by a properly defined transformation [2]. This allows the preservation of the spacetime description of the theory, even if one chooses to work with canonical variables.

The histories theory provides a formalism that allows the incorporation of other theories, enriching them with a purely spacetime kinematical description, while preserving the main features of their dynamical behavior. Moreover, the histories theory may be developed in a quantisation scheme on its own right, which is expected to be characterised by two important features: first the preservation of the full spacetime description even at the quantum level and second, the quantum mechanical treatment of the full Lorentzian metric–and not only of its spatial components or its perturbations around a fixed background.

The technical problem in a histories-based quantisation of general relativity is the rigorous implementation of the dynamics by a history analogue of the Hamiltonian constraint operator: as in the standard canonical theory, the classical expression is non-quadratic—indeed non-polynomial—in the field variables, and so the construction of an operator for the Hamiltonian constraint seems a hopeless task using conventional methods. For this reason, the most promising strategy would be to exploit the basic ideas of loop quantum gravity, which has made the greatest progress in the construction of such an operator [10].

The mainline approach towards loop quantum gravity has as a starting point the formulation of general relativity in terms of the Barbero connection [11]: this connection defines the holonomy algebra, the representation theory of which provides the construction of the kinematical Hilbert space in loop quantum gravity.

The Barbero connection can either be obtained from a canonical transformation in a space extending the phase space of general relativity, or from a covariant Lagrangian, written by Holst [12], through a Legendre transform. The latter procedure, however, involves a choice of the temporal gauge, and for this reason the very definition of the Barbero connection is gauge-dependent. A consequence of gauge-dependence is the loss of the spacetime background independence of the theory.

The most important benefit provided by the introduction of the Barbero connection is that it is a connection with respect to the SU(2) group. This fact makes much easier the study of the representation of the loop algebra, because SU(2) is a compact group that possesses a unique normalised Haar measure.

It would clearly be a benefit to the histories formalism if an object with the properties of the Barbero connection could be identified without compromising the gauge invariance—and hence the spacetime covariance—of the theory. We demonstrate that this is indeed the case in section 4.

The structure of this paper is the following. In Section 2 we provide a brief summary of the histories theory applied to general relativity—for details see [1, 2].

In Section 3 we develop the histories description for general relativity expressed in terms of the connection and tetrad variables, using the Holst Lagrangian.

In Section 4 we examine the definability of the Barbero connection in absence of gauge fixing and comment on possible approaches to quantisation. In the last section we summarise and discuss our results.

## 2 Background: A histories version of general relativity

**The basic structure of the HPO histories theory.** In the consistent-histories theory a history is defined as a sequence of time-ordered propositions about properties of a physical system, each one represented by a projection operator. When a certain 'decoherence condition' is satisfied by a set of histories, the elements of this set can be given probabilities. The probability information of the theory is encoded in the decoherence functional, a complex function of pairs of histories.

In the HPO approach of the histories theory, propositions about the histories of a system are represented by projection operators on a new, 'history' Hilbert space. One may understand the history Hilbert space $\mathcal{V}$ in terms of the representations of the 'history group' [13, 14]—in elementary systems this is the history analogue of the canonical group. For example, for the simple case of a point particle moving on a line, the history group for a continuous time parameter $t$ is described by the history commutation relations

$$\begin{aligned} [x_t, x_{t'}] &= 0 = [p_t, p_{t'}] \qquad (2.1)\\ [x_t, p_{t'}] &= i\hbar\delta(t-t'), \qquad (2.2)\end{aligned}$$

where the spectral projectors of the (Schrödinger picture) operators $x_t$ and $p_t$ represent the values of position and momentum respectively at time $t$. This particular history algebra is equivalent to the algebra of a $1+1$-dimensional quantum field theory, and hence techniques from quantum field theory can be used in the study of the history Hilbert space. This was done successfully in [14], where we showed that the physically appropriate representation can be uniquely constructed by demanding the existence of a time-averaged Hamiltonian operator $H := \int dt\, H_t$.

The study of continuous-time transformations led a very important result for the temporal structure of the theory: there exist *two* distinct types of time transformation. One refers to time as it appears in temporal logic—the $t$-label in Eqs. (2.1–2.2). The other refers to time as it appears in the implementation of dynamical laws—the label $s$ in the 'history Heisenberg picture' operator $x_t(s) := e^{isH}x_te^{-isH}$. The definition of these two distinct operators, implementing time transformations, signified the *distinction between the kinematics and the dynamics of the theory*. More important, for any specific physical system these two transformations are intertwined by the definition of the *action operator*—a quantum analogue of the classical action functional.

In the classical histories theory, the basic mathematical entity is the space of differentiable paths $\Pi = \{\gamma \mid \gamma : \mathbb{R} \to \Gamma\}$, taking their value in the space of single-time classical phase space $\Gamma$. The key idea in this new approach to classical histories is contained in the symplectic structure on this space of temporal paths $t \to (x_t, p_t)$ corresponding to the following Poisson brackets

$$\begin{aligned} \{x_t, x_{t'}\} &= 0 = \{p_t, p_{t'}\}\\ \{x_t, p_{t'}\} &= \delta(t, t'),\end{aligned}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} x_t : \Pi &\to \mathbb{R}\\ \gamma &\mapsto x_t(\gamma) := x(\gamma(t)).\end{aligned}$$

Analogous to the quantum case, there are generators for two types of time transformation: one associated with classical temporal logic, and one with classical dynamics.

The classical Hamilton equations may be written in terms of the Liouville function $V$ and the smeared Hamiltonian function $H$, which are the classical analogues of the corresponding operators we defined for the quantum theory

$$\{F_t, V\}_\Pi(\gamma_{cl}) = \{F_t, H\}_\Pi(\gamma_{cl}),$$

where $V(\gamma) := \int dt p_t \dot{x}_t$, and $\{F_t, V\} = \dot{F}_t$. One significant feature is that the paths corresponding to solutions of the classical equations of motion are determined by the requirement that they remain invariant under the symplectic transformations generated by the action $S$, for all functions $F_t$

$$\{\, F \,, S \,\}_{\Pi}(\gamma_{cl}) = 0, \tag{2.3}$$

where $S = V - H$. The Eq. (2.3) is essentially the histories analogue of the least action principle.

**Spacetime description of histories general relativity theory.** A significant result emerged from the histories general relativity theory: it is possible to develop a histories theory for quantising the full spacetime metric of classical gravity[2].

In this context, a 'covariant' description of the histories gravity theory has been developed [1, 2], in terms of a Lorentzian metric $g$, and its 'conjugate momentum' tensor $\pi$, on a spacetime manifold $M$, with topology $\Sigma \times \mathbb{R}$. The history space has as elements the pairs $(g_{\mu\nu}, \pi^{\kappa\lambda})$, and it is equipped with the covariant symplectic form

$$\Omega_{cov} = \int d^4X \;\delta\pi^{\mu\nu}(X) \wedge \delta g_{\mu\nu}(X). \tag{2.4}$$

**The spacetime diffeomorphisms group** Diff(M)**.** The relation between the spacetime diffeomorphisms algebra, and the Dirac constraint algebra has long been an important matter for discussion in quantum gravity. In this new construction, the two algebras appear together for the first time: the history theory contains a representation of both the spacetime diffeomorphism group *and* the Dirac algebra of constraints of the canonical theory. Indeed, for each vector field $W$ on the spacetime manifold $M$, the 'Liouville' function is defined as

$$V_W := \int d^4X \,\pi^{\mu\nu}(X)\,\mathcal{L}_W g_{\mu\nu}(X), \tag{2.5}$$

where $\mathcal{L}_W$ denotes the Lie derivative with respect to $W$. The functions $V_W$, satisfy the Lie algebra of the spacetime diffeomorphisms group $[V_{W_1}\,, V_{W_2}] = V_{[W_1,W_2]}$ , for all spacetime vector fields $W_1, W_2$.

**Spacetime and canonical descriptions.** In the standard canonical formalism we introduce a spacelike foliation $\mathcal{E} : \mathbb{R} \times \Sigma \rightarrow M$ on $M$, with respect to a fixed Lorentzian four-metric $g$. However a foliation cannot be spacelike with respect to *all* metrics $g$ and in general, for an arbitrary metric $g$ the pullback of a metric $\mathcal{E}^*g$ *is not* a Riemannian metric on $\Sigma$. The notion of 'spacelike' has *no a priori* meaning in a theory of quantum gravity, in which the metric is a non-deterministic dynamical variable. In absence of deterministic dynamics, the relation between canonical and covariant variables appears rather puzzling.

In histories theory this problem is addressed by introducing the notion of a *metric dependent* foliation $\mathcal{E}[g]$. This is defined as a map $\mathcal{E} : LRiem(M) \mapsto FolM$, that assigns to each Lorentzian metric $g$ a foliation that is *always* spacelike with respect to that metric; $FolM$ is the space of foliations on $M$.

We then use the metric dependent foliation $\mathcal{E}[g]$ to define the canonical decomposition of the metric $g$ with respect to the canonical three-metric $h_{ij}$, the lapse function $N$ and the shift vector $N^i$. For example, the three-metric $h_{ij}$ reads

$$h_{ij}(t,\underline{x}) \;:=\; \mathcal{E}^{\mu}_{,i}(t,\underline{x};g)\,\mathcal{E}^{\nu}_{,j}(t,\underline{x};g)\,g_{\mu\nu}(\mathcal{E}(t,\underline{x};g)). \tag{2.6}$$

Defined in this way $h_{ij}$ is *always* a Riemannian metric, with the correct signature. Hence, the $3+1$ decomposition preserves the spacetime character of the canonical variables. In the histories theory therefore, *the* $3+1$ *decomposition preserves the spacetime character of the canonical variables*, a feature that we may expect to hold in a theory of quantum gravity.

One may therefore employ histories of canonical variables as coordinates on the space $\Pi^{cov} = T^*\text{LRiem}(M)$. We thus obtain the history version of the canonical Poisson brackets from the covariant ones, and we can write the history analogue of the canonical constraints. The canonical description leads naturally to a one-parameter family of super-hamiltonians $t \mapsto \mathcal{H}_{\perp}(t,\underline{x})$ and super-momenta $t \mapsto \mathcal{H}_i(t,\underline{x})$[1, 2].

**Invariance transformations.** The introduction of the *equivariance condition* leads to an explicit mathematical relation between the Diff(M) group and the canonical constraints. This condition follows from the requirement of general covariance, namely that the description of the theory ought to be invariant under changes of coordinate systems, implemented by spacetime diffeomorphisms. Loosely speaking, the equivariance condition makes it possible that the foliation functional 'looks the same' in all coordinate systems.

A metric-dependent foliation functional $\mathcal{E} : \text{LRiem}(M) \to \text{Fol}(M)$ is defined as an *equivariant foliation* if it satisfies the mathematical condition

$$\mathcal{E}[f^*g] = f^{-1} \circ \mathcal{E}[g],$$

for all Lorentzian metrics $g$ and $f \in \text{Diff}(M)$.

Hence, if we perform a change of the coordinate system of the theory under a spacetime diffeomorphism, then the expressions of the objects defined in it will change, and so the foliation functional $\mathcal{E}[g]$ and the four-metric $g$ will also change. Then, the change of the foliation due to the change of the coordinate system must be compensated by the change due to its functional dependence on the metric $g$. This is essentially the *passive interpretation* of the spacetime diffeomorphisms.

The equivariance condition manifests a striking result: the action of the spacetime diffeomorphisms group Diff(M) *preserves* the set of the constraints, in the sense that it transforms a constraint into another of the same type but of different argument. Hence, the choice of an equivariance foliation implements that histories canonical field variables related by diffeomorphisms are physically equivalent.

Furthermore, this result means also that, the group Diff(M) is represented in the space of the true degrees of freedom, the reduced phase space. Hence, in the histories theory the requirement of the physical equivalence of different choices of time direction is satisfied by means of the equivariance condition.

**Reduced state space.** We define the history constraint surface $C_h = \{t \mapsto C, t \in \mathbb{R}\}$, as the space of maps from the real line to the single-time constraint surface $C$ of canonical general relativity.

The history reduced state space is obtained as the quotient of the history constraint surface $C_h$, with respect to the action of the constraints, i.e., it is the space of orbits on $C_h$ arising from the action of the constraints.

The histories version of the Hamiltonian constraint is defined as $H_\kappa = \int dt\, \kappa(t) h_t$, where $h_t$ is first-class constraint. For all values of the smearing function $\kappa(t)$, the history Hamiltonian constraint $H_\kappa$ generates canonical transformations on the history constraint surface.

The history reduced state space $\Pi_{red} = \{t \mapsto \Gamma_{red}, t \in \mathbb{R}\}$, is a symplectic manifold that can be identified with the space of paths on the canonical reduced state space $\Gamma_{red}$.

It has been proved [2] that the histories reduced state space is *identical* with the space of paths on the canonical reduced state space. Hence, the time parameter $t$ also exists on $\Pi_{red}$, and the notion of *time ordering* remains on the space of the true degrees of freedom $\Pi_{red}$. This last result is in contrast to the standard canonical theory where there exists ambiguity with respect to the notion of time after reduction.

The phase space action functional $S$ commutes weakly with the constraints, so it can be projected on the histories reduced state space. It then determines the equations of motion, as we have shown in the theory of classical histories [9].

A function on the full state space $\Pi$ may be considered to be a physical observable (*i.e.,* to be projectable into a function on $\Pi_{red}$), if it commutes with the constraints on the constraint surface.

The equations of motion are the paths on the phase space that remain invariant under the symplectic transformations generated by the projected action

$$\{\tilde{S}, F_t\}\,(\gamma_{cl}) = 0\,,$$

where $F_t$ is constant in $t$ and $\tilde{S}$ is the action projected on $\Pi_{red}$.

The canonical action functional $S$ is also diffeomorphic-invariant

$$\{V_W, S\} = 0. \tag{2.7}$$

Therefore, the dynamics of the histories theory is invariant under the group of spacetime diffeomorphisms.

We can distinguish the paths corresponding to the classical equations of motion by the condition

$$\{F, \tilde{V}\}_{\gamma_{cl}} = 0, \tag{2.8}$$

where $F$ is a functional of the field variables, and $\gamma_{cl}$ is a solution to the equations of motion.

In standard canonical theory, the elements of the reduced state space are all solutions to the classical equations of motion. In histories canonical theory, however, an element of the reduced state space is a solution to the classical equations of motion only if it also satisfies the condition Eq. (2.8). The reason for this is that the histories reduced state space $\Pi_{red}$ contains a much larger number of paths (essentially all paths on $\Gamma_{red}$ ).

# 3 The histories theory of the connection formalism for general relativity

## 3.1 The covariant description

The building block of the basic variables employed in loop quantum gravity is a pair of conjugate variables, consisting of a densitised triad $\tilde{E}^i_a$ and an $SU(2)$ three-connection $A^i_a$. The description of general relativity in terms of these variables can be obtained from two different procedures: one may either enlarge the geometrodynamical state space and identify the relevant variables through a suitable canonical transformation; or one may start from a spacetime action [12] by following the usual Dirac-Bergmann theory of constraints (together with partial gauge fixing).

The histories approach highlights the spacetime aspects of general relativity, hence it is the latter procedure that we shall adopt. As starting point we consider the Holst action

$$S[E,\omega] = \int d^4X(E)E^\mu_I E^\nu_J(\Omega^{IJ}_{\mu\nu} - \beta^{-1}{}^*\Omega^{IJ}_{\mu\nu}), \tag{3.1}$$

where $\beta$ is known as the Immirzi parameter [16], while

$$\Omega^{IJ}_{\mu\nu} = \partial_\mu\omega + n^{IJ} - \partial_\nu\omega^{IJ}_\mu + [\omega_\mu, \omega_\nu]^{IJ}, \tag{3.2}$$

and ${}^*\Omega^{IJ}_{\mu\nu} := \frac{1}{2}\epsilon^{IJ}{}_{KL}\Omega^{KL}_{\mu\nu}$.

The action (3.1) is a function on the space $\Lambda$ of configurational histories, that consists of tetrads $E^I_\mu$, and Lorentz-connections $\omega^{IJ}_\mu$, on a four-manifold $M$. Note that $\Lambda$ carries no symplectic structure.

The space $\Pi_{cov} := T^*\Lambda$ of phase space histories is the cotangent bundle of $\Lambda$. It consists of variables $(E^I_\mu, \omega^{IJ}_\mu, {}^E\pi^\mu_{IJ}, {}^\omega\pi^\mu_{IJ})$ and it is equipped with the covariant histories symplectic form

$$\Omega = \int d^4X \left[\delta^E\pi^\mu_I \wedge \delta E^I_\mu + \delta^\omega\pi^\mu_{IJ} \wedge \delta\omega^{IJ}_\mu\right]. \tag{3.3}$$

We define functions $V_W$ on $\Pi_{cov}$,

$$V_W = \int d^4X \; [{}^E\pi^\mu_I \mathcal{L}_W E^I_\mu + {}^\omega\pi^\mu_{IJ} \mathcal{L}_W \omega^{IJ}_\mu], \tag{3.4}$$

where $W$ is a vector field on $M$ and $\mathcal{L}$ denotes the Lie derivative. The functions $V_W$ correspond to a symplectic action of the group $Diff(M)$ on $\Pi_{cov}$ since they satisfy the Lie algebra of the $Diff(M)$ group

$$\{V_{W_1}, V_{W_2}\} = V_{[W_1, W_2]}. \tag{3.5}$$

It is easy to check that $V_W$ generates spacetime diffeomorphisms upon the canonical variables, for example

$$\begin{aligned} \{V_W, E^I_\mu\} &= -\mathcal{L}_W E^I_\mu \\ \{V_W, \omega^{IJ}_\mu\} &= -\mathcal{L}_W \omega^{IJ}_\mu. \end{aligned} \tag{3.6}$$

## 3.2 The $3+1$-decomposition

Similarly to the case of the metric variables described in Section 2, the space $\Pi_{cov}$ of tetrads and Lorentz connections is fully compatible with the 3+1 decomposition of the space $\Lambda$ and hence it can incorporate the description of histories of canonical variables.

The first step in a 3+1 decomposition involves the specification of a spacelike foliation. In order to preserve the spacelike character of the canonical description it is necessary for this foliation to be a function of the 4-metric $g$, as explained in Sec. 2–see [1] for details. The metric is defined on $\Pi_{cov}$ as a function of the tetrad variables

$$g_{\mu\nu} = \eta_{IJ} E^I_\mu E^J_\nu. \tag{3.7}$$

Hence, for each specific Lorentzian metric $g$ we choose a spacelike foliation, $\mathcal{E} : \mathbb{R} \times \Sigma \rightarrow M$, with an associated family of spacelike embeddings $\mathcal{E}_t : \Sigma \rightarrow M$, $t \in \mathbb{R}$. Given a foliation functional $\mathcal{E}$, we can define the normal unit timelike vector to the foliation $n^\mu(X; g]$, the vector field $t^\mu(X) = \dot{\mathcal{E}}^\mu(\mathcal{E}^{-1}(X))$, which specifies our direction of time and the 'projector' fields $\mathcal{E}^\mu_{,a} = \frac{\partial \mathcal{E}^\mu}{\partial x^a}$.

The pull-back of the tetrad and the four-connection on each spacelike 3-surface $\Sigma_t = \mathcal{E}_t^{-1}(M)$ are defined as

$$
\begin{aligned}
{}^3E^I_a(t,x) &:= \mathcal{E}^\mu_{,a} E^I_\mu(\mathcal{E}(t,x)) && (3.8)\\
{}^3\omega^{IJ}_a(t,x) &= \mathcal{E}^\mu_{,a} \omega^{IJ}_\mu(\mathcal{E}(t,x)). && (3.9)
\end{aligned}
$$

We also define the lapse function $N$ and the shift vector $N_a$ as

$$
\begin{aligned}
N(t,x) &= \dot{\mathcal{E}}^\mu \, n_\mu(\mathcal{E}(t,x)) && (3.10)\\
N_a(t,x) &= \mathcal{E}^\mu_{,a} \, \dot{\mathcal{E}}^\nu \, g_{\mu\nu}(\mathcal{E}(t,x)), && (3.11)
\end{aligned}
$$

and the projection of the tetrad along $n^\mu$ as

$$
n^I(t,X) = n^\mu E^I_\mu(\mathcal{E}(t,x)). \tag{3.12}
$$

The latter satisfies the conditions ${}^3E^I_a n^J \eta_{IJ} = 0, \; n^I n_I = 1$. We also consider the projections of the four-connection along $t^\mu$

$$
\alpha^{IJ} = \dot{\mathcal{E}}^\mu \, \omega^{IJ}_\mu. \tag{3.13}
$$

The 3+1 decomposition results to the substitution of the original set of 'covariant' coordinates $E^I_\mu, \omega^{IJ}_\mu$ on $\Lambda$ with the following ones: ${}^3E^I_a, N, N_a, n^I, {}^3\omega^{IJ}_a, \alpha^{IJ}$. The new coordinates are essentially paths from the axis of time $\mathbb{R}$ to the single-time configuration space of the theory.

It is very convenient to choose a new set of variables. One of the aims of this paper is to see how the Barbero connection appears within a gauge-invariant spacetime description. The Barbero connection is defined after a specific gauge fixing: choosing the temporal gauge $n^I = (1,0,0,0)$. For this reason we choose variables that are convenient for keeping track of this particular gauge.

Let us denote by $\Lambda^I_J(t,x)$ the $SL(2,\mathbf{C})$ gauge transformation that takes the scalar fields $n^I$ to the constant vector ${}^0n^I = (1,0,0,0)$. We write,

$$
\Lambda^I_J(t,x) = \delta^I_J + \frac{1}{n \cdot {}^0n - 1}(n^I - {}^0n^I)(n_J - {}^0n_J). \tag{3.14}
$$

Next, we transform by $\Lambda^{IJ}$ all fields with internal indices. We define

$$
\begin{aligned}
{}^3E'^I_a &:= \Lambda^I{}_J {}^3E^J_a && (3.15)\\
{}^3\omega'^{IJ}_a &:= \Lambda^I{}_K {}^3\omega^{KL}_a \Lambda_L{}^J && (3.16)\\
\alpha'^{IJ} &:= \Lambda^I{}_K {}^3\alpha^{KL} \Lambda_L{}^J. && (3.17)
\end{aligned}
$$

But ${}^3E^I_a n_I = 0$, hence ${}^3E'^I_a$ is of the form $(0, E^1_a, E^2_a, E^3_a)$. We notice that the variables $E^i_a = (E^1_a, E^2_a, E^3_a)$ define a field of triads on $\sigma$, since

$$
E^i_a E^j_b \delta_{ij} = h_{ab} := \mathcal{E}^\mu_a \mathcal{E}^\nu_b g_{\mu\nu}. \tag{3.18}
$$

The property above distinguishes the variables we employ here, from the variables $E^i_a$ of Ref.[15], which become triads only after the imposition of the temporal gauge.

The form of the Holst Lagrangian, suggests that the following combinations of the connection variables are the most convenient

$$\omega^i_a : \quad = \quad {}^3\omega_a'^{0i} - \frac{1}{2\beta}\epsilon^{ijk3}\omega_a'^{jk} \tag{3.19}$$

$$\chi^i_a : \quad = \quad \frac{1}{2}\epsilon^{ijk3}\omega_a'^{jk} + \frac{1}{\beta}{}^3\omega_a'^{0i} \tag{3.20}$$

$$\rho^i : \quad = \quad \alpha'^{0i} - \frac{1}{2\beta}\epsilon^{ijk}\alpha'^{jk} \tag{3.21}$$

$$\sigma^i : \quad = \quad \frac{1}{2}\epsilon^{ijk}\alpha'^{jk} + \frac{1}{\beta}\alpha'^{0i}. \tag{3.22}$$

For further convenience in the description of the constraints we employ the densitised triad $\tilde{E}^a_i = (E)E^a_i$ and the densitised lapse $\tilde{N} = N/E$, where $E$ is the square root of the determinant of the three-metric $h_{ab}$. We also write $n^I = (\sqrt{1+\xi\cdot\xi}, \xi^i)$.

Hence we have chosen a coordinate system on $\Lambda$, based on the canonical history variables $(\tilde{E}^a_i, \omega^i_a, \chi^i_a, \rho^i, \sigma^i, \tilde{N}, N_a, \xi^i)(t, \underline{x})$. The change of variables on $\Lambda$ is essentially a contact transformation. It can therefore be lifted to a symplectic transformation in $\Pi_{cov} = T^*\Lambda$. Hence the symplectic form on $\Pi_{cov}$ can be written as

$$\Omega = \int dt \int d^3x \left(\delta^E p^i_a \wedge \delta E^i_a + \delta^\omega p^a_i \wedge \delta\omega^i_a + \delta^\chi p^a_i \wedge \delta\chi^i_a \right.$$
$$\left. + \delta^\rho p_i \wedge \delta\rho^i + \delta^\sigma p_i \wedge \delta\sigma^i + \delta^{\tilde{N}} p \wedge \delta\tilde{N} + \delta^N p^a \wedge \delta N_a + \delta^\xi p_i \wedge \delta\xi^i \right). \tag{3.23}$$

The momenta in (3.23) can be expressed as functions of the covariant momenta and configuration variables. The explicit relations can be obtained by substituting $E^I_\mu$ and $\omega^{IJ}_\mu$ by the corresponding canonical variables in the expression for the symplectic potential $\Theta_{cov} = \int d^4X[{}^E\pi^\mu_I \delta E^I_\mu + {}^\omega\pi^\mu_{IJ} \wedge \delta\omega^{IJ}_\mu$, by the canonical variables. For this purpose we use the equations

$$E^I_\mu \quad = \quad \mathcal{E}^a_\mu \, {}^3E^I_a + n_\mu n^I \tag{3.24}$$

$$\omega^{IJ}_\mu \quad = \quad (\mathcal{E}^a_\mu - N^{-1} n_\mu N^a) \, {}^3\omega^{IJ}_a + N^{-1} n_\mu \alpha^{IJ}. \tag{3.25}$$

The expression (3.23) demonstrates that the space $\Pi$ is isomorphic to the space of paths over the phase space of the corresponding canonical theory.

## 3.3 The constraints

So far the description is purely kinematical; the only input has been the choice of variables for the covariant description and the implementation of the 3+1 splitting. In order to introduce dynamics, we must consider the constraints corresponding to the Holst action [12].

In the Appendix we provide details about the Legendre transform of the Holst Lagrangian. The approach followed in this paper is different from the one usually encountered in the literature, because it preserves the relation of the canonical variables to the original covariant ones[1]. We would not be able otherwise to verify the invariance of the constraints and the equations of motion under the spacetime diffeomorphisms action on $\Pi_{cov}$. The other difference of the Legendre transform we develop in the Appendix is that the canonical variables we employ have a natural geometric interpretation even in absence of gauge fixing.

The constraints restrict the space of possible histories to a submanifold of $\Pi_{cov}$. We identify the second-class primary constraints ($30 \times \infty^4$)

$$\begin{aligned} {}^{\omega}p^a_i - \tilde{E}^a_i &= 0 && (3.26)\\ {}^{\chi}p^a_i &= 0 && (3.27)\\ {}^{E}p^i_a &= 0 && (3.28)\\ {}^{\xi}p^l + \epsilon^{ijk}\tilde{E}^a_i[\chi^j_a v^k_l + \omega^j_a w^k_l] &= 0, && (3.29) \end{aligned}$$

the ($6 \times \infty^4$) second class secondary constraints (for the full expression of the functions $f^{ij}$ see the Appendix)

$$2\tilde{E}^{a(i}\chi^{j)}_a = f^{ij}(\tilde{E}, \omega, \xi), \tag{3.30}$$

the ($10 \times \infty^4$) primary first-class constraints

$$\begin{aligned} {}^{\tilde{N}}p &= 0 && (3.31)\\ {}^{N}p^a &= 0 && (3.32)\\ {}^{\rho}p_i &= 0 && (3.33)\\ {}^{\sigma}p_i &= 0, && (3.34) \end{aligned}$$

and the ($10 \times \infty^4$) secondary first-class constraints

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{F}^k &= -\tilde{E}^a_i\epsilon^{ijk}[(1+\beta^{-2})^{-1}(\omega^j_a + \beta^{-1}\chi^j_a) + v^j_l\partial_a\xi^l) = 0 && (3.35)\\ \mathcal{G}^k &= \partial_a\tilde{E}^a_k - \epsilon^{ijk}\tilde{E}^a_i[(1+\beta^{-2})^{-1}(\chi^j_a - \beta^{-1}\omega^j_a) + w^j_l\partial_a\xi^l] = 0 && (3.36)\\ \mathcal{H}_a &= -\tilde{E}^b_i\left[2\partial_{[a}\omega^i_{b]} - \epsilon^{ijk}\omega^j_b v^k_l\partial_a\xi^l + 2\epsilon^{ijk}\omega^j_{[a}\partial_{b]}\xi^l w^k_l\right] \\ &- (-2\omega^j_a L^j - 2(1+\beta^{-2})\partial_a\xi^l v^k_l L^k) - \chi^j_a\mathcal{G}^i_\nu && (3.37)\\ \mathcal{H} &= \tilde{E}^a_i\tilde{E}^b_j\epsilon^{ijk}[(2\partial_{[a}\chi^k_{b]} - (1+\beta^{-2})^{-1}\epsilon^{kmn}(\omega^m_a\omega^n_b - \chi^m_a\chi^n_b \\ &+ \beta^{-1}\chi^m_a\omega^n_b + \beta^{-1}\omega^m_a\chi^n_b)) + 2\epsilon^{kmn}(\omega^m_{[b}v^n_l - \chi^m_b w^n_l)\partial_{a]}\xi^l], && (3.38) \end{aligned}$$

---

[1] The usual procedure involves substituting the second-class constraints that appear in the Legendre transform (3.26, 3.27) by the single one that is expressed in terms of the conjugate momentum of ${}^3\omega^{IJ}_a$, namely $\epsilon^{IJKL}\,{}^{\omega}p^a_{IJ}\,{}^{\omega}p^b_{KL} = 0$. While this method is more convenient for computational purposes, it hides the immediate relation between the components of the tetrad and the covariant momentum conjugate to the Lorentz connection.

where $w^m_n, v^m_n$ are functions of $\xi$ defined in Eq.(A.3) of the Appendix, and $L^k = \frac{1}{2}\epsilon^{ijk}\tilde{E}^{ai}\chi^j_a$.

The constraints $\mathcal{H}$, $\mathcal{H}_a$ are obtained by the variation of the lapse $N$ and the shift $N_a$ respectively, hence they correspond to the Hamiltonian and momentum constraint, while the constraints $\mathcal{G}^i, \mathcal{F}^i$ are obtained by the variation of $\rho_i$ and $\sigma_i$ respectively. The latter constraints correspond to the $SL(2,\mathbf{C})$ gauge constraints of the usual treatment. At this level the algebra of the secondary first-class constraints is trivial, because the variables $\tilde{E}^a_i, \omega^i_a$ commute prior to the imposition of the second-class constraints (3.26).

## 3.4 The spacetime diffeomorphism invariance

In order to demonstrate the diffeomorphism invariance of the reduced state space, we need to restrict our considerations to equivariant foliation functionals– see Sec. 2. We denote by $A(\cdot, g]$ any tensor field associated to the foliation functional, that carries a dependence on the metric $g$. The physical requirement is that the change of the tensor field $A$ under a diffeomorphism transformation is compensated by the change due to its functional dependence on $g$.

For an infinitesimal spacetime diffeomorphism transformation the equivariance condition (2.7) can be expressed as

$$\mathcal{L}_W A(X;g] = \int d^4X' \, \frac{\delta A(X;g]}{\delta g_{\mu\nu}(X')} \mathcal{L}_W g_{\mu\nu}(X') \,. \tag{3.39}$$

The analysis of the diffeomorphism invariance of the constraints proceeds as in the case of [2]. The result is identical, namely that the constraints are preserved by the action of the diffeomorphisms generated by the $V_W$. It can be verified by explicit calculation, however the general argument is the following.

The functions of the constraints may be smeared with suitable fields on $\Sigma \times \mathbb{R}$. For example, the momentum constraint may be expressed in smeared form as $\mathcal{H}(M) = \int dt d^3x \mathcal{H}_a(t,x) M^a(t,x)$. In general, the smeared form of a constraint $F^r$, where $r$ refers to any indices, may be denoted by the expression $F(M) = \int dt d^3x F^r(t,x) M_r(t,x)$. We substitute the canonical variables employed in the definition of the constraints, by their expressions in terms of the covariant objects $E^I_\mu, \omega^{IJ}_\mu, {}^E\pi^\mu_I, {}^\omega\pi^\mu_{IJ}$. For simplicity, we refer to all the covariant fields variables as $\phi_A$ (we only need to distinguish the tetrad later on).

We write the constraint expressed in terms of the covariant variables as $\int d^4X \, F^r(X, \phi_A, \mathcal{E}] \, M_r(X;g]$, where $\mathcal{E}$ are any fields defined with reference to the spacelike foliation (namely $\mathcal{E}^\mu_{,a}$ and $n^\mu$. The smearing fields $M^r$ now depend on $g$, because they are pull-backed to $M$ using the foliation functional. We then compute

$$\{V_W, F(M)\} = \int d^4X d^4X' \left[ \frac{\delta F^r(X,\phi,\mathcal{E})}{\delta \phi_A(X')} \mathcal{L}_W \phi_A(X') M^r(X,g] + \right.$$

$$
\left(\int d^4X'' \frac{\delta F^r(X,\phi,\mathcal{E})}{\delta\mathcal{E}(X'',g]} \frac{\delta\mathcal{E}(X'',g]}{\delta g_{\mu\nu}(X')} M^r(X,g] \right.
$$

$$
\left. + F^r(X) \frac{\delta M^r(X,g]}{\delta g_{\mu\nu}(X')} \right) 2E^I_\mu(X')E_{\nu I}(X') \Bigg]. \qquad (3.40)
$$

Using the equivariance condition we obtain

$$
\{V_W, F(M)\} = \int d^4X \mathcal{L}_W(F^r(X)M_r(X,g])
$$

$$
+ \int d^4X F^r(X) \left( -\mathcal{L}_W M^r + \int d^4X' \frac{\delta M^r(X,g]}{\delta g_{\mu\nu}(X')} 2E^I_\mu(X')E_{\nu I}(X') \right)
$$

$$
:= -F(\delta_W M), \qquad (3.41)
$$

where $\delta_W M = \mathcal{L}_W M^r - \int d^4X' \frac{\delta M^r(X,g]}{\delta g_{\mu\nu}(X')} 2E^I_\mu(X')E_{\nu I}(X')$, is an infinitesimal change to $M^r$ due to the total action of the diffeomorphisms.

Hence, the action of $V_W$ upon the constraints leaves the set of constraints invariant. It follows that $V_W$ can be projected to the histories reduced state space.

The same argument holds for the equations of motion. One may define the Liouville function on $\Pi_{cov}$ as

$$
V = \int dt \int d^3x \left( {}^E p^i_a \dot{E}^i_a + {}^\omega p^a_i \dot{\omega}^i_a + {}^\chi p^a_i \dot{\chi}^i_a + {}^\rho p_i \dot{\rho}^j + {}^\sigma p_i \dot{\sigma}^j \right.
$$

$$
\left. + {}^{\tilde{N}} p \dot{\tilde{N}} + {}^N p^a \dot{N}_a + {}^\xi p_i \dot{\xi}^i \right). \qquad (3.42)
$$

Since the constraint functions are all ultra-local in $t$, i.e. they do not involve derivatives with respect to $t$, we obtain

$$
\{V, F(M)\} = F(\dot{M}). \qquad (3.43)
$$

Hence, $V$ commutes weakly with the constraints and thus it can be projected to the reduced state space. In the reduced state space the Hamiltonian is zero, and for this reason the projection of $V$ there coincides with the projection of the action functional. It therefore generates the solution to the equations of motion: if $\tilde{V}$ is the projection of $V$ on the reduced history space then the equation

$$
\{\tilde{V}, F\}(\gamma_{cl}) = 0 \qquad (3.44)
$$

identifies the classical equations of motion, for any function $F$ on $\Pi_{red}$.

Finally, using arguments similar to the above, it is easy to demonstrate that $V$ remains invariant under the action of the group $V_W$ of spacetime diffeomorphisms, provided that the foliation is equivariant. The derivation is formally identical to that of Ref. [2], where the reader is referred to for details.

# 4 The Barbero connection

The loop variables employed in quantisation are defined in terms of the Barbero connection, which forms a canonical pair with the triad on a state space. The latter is constructed after the imposition of some of the constraints [12, 15]. To be precise, the constraints that are imposed on this construction are the second-class ones and the primary first-class ones, while 'half' of the gauge constraints are removed through the selection of the temporal gauge.

In this section, we shall consider the issue of the definability of the Barbero connection without any gauge fixing. This will allow us to discuss the extent to which the usual loop variables are compatible with a spacetime description. Note that while we work within the history formalism for definiteness, the arguments we present can be immediately translated to the canonical (single-time) context.

The history space is a symplectic manifold, and for this reason one may follow the same procedure for implementing the constraints as in the standard canonical case.

The first step is to impose the second-class constraints. We denote the resulting manifold as $\Pi_{s.c.}$. By definition (of the second-class constraints concept) the symplectic form on $\Pi_{s.c.}$ is non-degenerate. The constraints (3.26–3.28) imply that the triads and the $\omega_a^i$-part of the four-connection $\omega_\mu^{IJ}$ form a pair of conjugate variables. The symplectic form on $\Pi_{s.c.}$ is

$$\Omega_{s.c.} = \int dt \int d^3x [\delta \tilde{E}_i^a \wedge \delta\omega_a^i + \delta^\xi p_i \wedge \delta\xi^i + \delta^\rho p_i \wedge \delta\rho^i + \delta^\sigma p_i \wedge \delta\sigma^i + \delta^{\tilde{N}} p \wedge \delta\tilde{N} + \delta^N p^a \wedge \delta N_a]. \tag{4.1}$$

The constraints (3.29, 3.30) determine the components $\chi_a^i$ in terms of the other variables. The primary first-class constraints commute with the secondary first-class ones, hence they can be imposed separately. By imposing the former and then excising the degenerate directions, we construct the space $\Pi_1$. The latter is spanned by the variables $\tilde{E}, \omega, \xi, {}^\xi p$ and it carries the symplectic form

$$\Omega_1 = \int dt \int d^3x [\delta \tilde{E}_i^a \wedge \delta\omega_a^i + \delta^\xi p_i \wedge \delta\xi^i]. \tag{4.2}$$

First, let us recall that the Barbero connection is defined on a phase space, which is obtained by the choice of the temporal gauge $\xi^i = 0$ [12]. Gauge fixing allows the solution of one half of the gauge constraints. This results to the determination of ${}^\xi p$ in terms of the remaining canonical variables. The object $\omega_a^i$ transforms then as an SU(2) connection under the remaining gauge constraints: this is the Barbero connection.

However, one may follow a different direction that allows the identification of the Barbero connection on the space $\Pi_1$, without any gauge fixing. For this purpose, we find a suitable variable that transforms as an $SU(2)$ connection under a combination of the gauge constraints. We notice that the combination $\beta\mathcal{F} - \mathcal{G}$ leads to the Gauss-law constraint

$$\mathcal{G}^k_{Gauss} = \partial_a \tilde{E}^a_k + \beta\epsilon^{ijk}\tilde{E}^a_i(\omega^j_a - \beta^{-1}w^j_l\partial_a\xi^l + v^j_l\partial_a\xi^l) = 0, \tag{4.3}$$

where $v^j_l, w^j_l$ are given by Eqs. (A.3) in the Appendix.

From Eq. (4.3) we notice that the object

$$A^i_a = \omega^i_a - \beta^{-1}w^i_l\partial_a\xi^l + v^i_l\partial_a\xi^l \tag{4.4}$$

transforms as an $SU(2)$ connection[2] under $\mathcal{G}^i_{Gauss}$, it is conjugate to the triad and coincides with the Barbero connection on the gauge fixing surface $\xi^i = 0$. Hence, it is the proper pull-back of the Barbero connection on $\Pi_1$.

Using Eq. (3.29) we bring the constraints $\mathcal{F}^k = 0$ on $\Pi_1$ into the form $\mathcal{F}'^k = 0$, where

$$\mathcal{F}'^k = {}^\xi p^k + \tilde{E}^a_i\epsilon^{ijk}[(w^k_l - \beta v^k_l)\omega^j_a - \beta(1+\beta^{-2})v^j_m v^k_l\partial_a\xi^m]. \tag{4.5}$$

The implementation of the constraints (4.5) should allow us to get rid of the $\xi$ and ${}^\xi p$ variables and descend to the Barbero phase space. This, however, cannot be done in a gauge-invariant way. The reason is that the submanifold $\mathcal{F}'^i = 0$ is not preserved by the action of the remaining constraints—in particular the $\mathcal{G}^k_{Gauss}$ constraint. Moreover, the constraint $\mathcal{F}'$ leaves neither the triad, nor the Barbero connection invariant. A *partial* implementation of the constraints–while algebraically possible through gauge fixing–is geometrically inadmissible at this level.

In conclusion, the Barbero connection is well-defined on the space $\Pi_1$, which is obtained from the imposition of the second-class and the primary first-class constraints. The Barbero connection corresponds to a specific combination $A^i_a$ of the system's variables. This combination transforms as an SU(2) connection under a specific combination of the $SL(2, \mathbf{C})$ gauge constraints. It is however not possible to reduce the system further and go to a phase space that only contains the connections and the triads, unless one employs gauge-fixing. This implies that the basic variables employed in the loop quantum gravity–based as they are on the Barbero connection–are gauge dependent. The same holds for the remaining constraints on the Barbero phase space; their specific form is gauge dependent and for this reason they cannot be related to spacetime objects. Indeed, in the history context the action of the diffeomorphism group descends on $\Pi_1$, but it cannot descend to the Barbero phase space, because the introduction of a gauge-fixing is an additional 'external' structure that violates the background independence of the theory. The starting point of the loop quantisation is therefore gauge-dependent and does not have a straightforward spacetime description.

---

[2] We should recall that at this level (in absence of spinors and prior to quantisation) the gauge group is $SO(3)$ rather than $SU(2)$, but we ignore this distinction throughout this paper.

However, the loop variables may be obtained from a purely canonical procedure, in which the issue of gauge-dependence may not arise. One starts from the geometrodynamical phase space (usually after the implementation of the primary constraints), extends it to include an $SU(2)$ connection and performs a canonical transformation on the extended space. This leads essentially to the Barbero variables. Still, even if the problem of gauge dependence can be avoided, the problem of spacetime covariance remains: the resulting canonical theory (and hence the quantisation scheme) is not spacetime covariant, because the extension cannot be brought into a correspondence with a Lagrangian action. One may argue that spacetime covariance needs not be a fundamental symmetry of a quantum gravity theory and that it only arises at the classical limit.

However, in this paper we contend that a quantisation along the loop quantum gravity lines is possible, if one starts from either the full covariant phase space $\Pi_{cov}$, or from the intermediate space $\Pi_1$ (or its analogues in the canonical description). The key idea in loop quantum gravity is the consideration of variables with support on one-dimensional objects (loops or graphs) and this can be achieved from either starting point.

**An augmented algebra for quantisation.** If we select the connection $A_a^i$ as one of the basic variables of the theory, then it is convenient to also employ a redefined $\xi$-momentum $\pi_i$ written as

$$\pi_i := {}^{\xi}p_i + \tilde{E}_j^a \frac{\delta G_a^j}{\delta \xi^i}, \tag{4.6}$$

where $G_a^i = -\beta^{-1} w_l^i \partial_a \xi^l + v_l^i \partial_a \xi^l$. The symplectic form $\Omega_1$ then reads

$$\Omega_1 = \int dt \int d^3x \, (\delta \tilde{E}_i^a \wedge \delta A_a^i + \delta \pi_i \wedge \delta \xi^i). \tag{4.7}$$

It is important to note that the variables $\xi^i, \pi_i$ commute with the $\mathcal{G}_{Gauss}$ constraint. They are therefore invariant under the gauge SU(2) rotations that characterise the $A_a^i$ connection.

The symplectic form (4.7) gives rise to the history algebra

$$\begin{aligned} \{A_a^i(t,x), \tilde{E}_j^b(t',x')\} &= \delta_a^b \delta_j^i \delta(t,t') \delta^3(x,x') && (4.8) \\ \{\xi^i(t,x), \pi_j(t',x')\} &= \delta_j^i \delta(t,t') \delta^3(x,x'). && (4.9) \end{aligned}$$

The corresponding canonical algebra is clearly

$$\begin{aligned} \{A_a^i(x), \tilde{E}_j^b(x')\} &= \delta_a^b \delta_j^i \delta^3(x,x') && (4.10) \\ \{\xi^i(x), \pi_j(x')\} &= \delta_j^i \delta^3(x,x'). && (4.11) \end{aligned}$$

This is essentially an augmentation of the canonical algebra of the standard theory by additional canonical variables that correspond to the internal field $n^I$

and its conjugate momentum. The subalgebra generated by the connection and the densitised triad generates the usual loop algebra employed in quantisation, that is defined in terms of the $T^0$ and the $T^1$ variables.

It follows that a quantisation procedure that emphasises spacetime covariance and gauge-fixing independence should augment the loop algebra by other variables, defined through $\xi^i$ and $\pi_i$. Clearly the explicit form of the quantisation algebra will affect the resulting quantum theory. The key issue at this point is whether a suitable algebra and representation thereof can be found, such that the quantum mechanical imposition of the $\mathcal{F}'$ constraint will reproduce the standard constructions of loop quantum theory. This is plausible, because the $\mathcal{F}'$ constraint is linear with respect to $\pi$. However, the agreement is not *a priori* guaranteed, because the result may be sensitive not only to the representation of the additional variables, but also on the procedure one employs in the quantum mechanical implementation of the constraints.

One possible procedure for quantising the loop algebra–augmented by the variables $\xi^i$ and $\pi_i$–may be provided by a generalisation of a technique developed in Ref. [17]. In this reference a histories description of quantum fields is developed, with the particular aim to treat the foliation as a potential quantum variable.

Finally, we would like to comment on the relation between the results of this paper with those of Refs.[18, 19]. In these papers, Samuel explains that the Barbero connection does not have a spacetime interpretation, because it is not the pullback of a spacetime connection onto the three-surface and because of the gauge-fixing employed in its definition. While we fully agree with these statements, we believe that they should not be taken to imply that the Barbero connection is not a suitable variable for quantisation. The Barbero connection appears naturally in the Legendre transform of the Holst action even in absence of gauge fixing. In the histories framework in particular, it may be employed to define loop variables similar to those employed in loop quantum gravity, without compromising the spacetime symmetries of the theory. The price we have to pay is that we need to consider additional variables, spanning the space $\Pi_1$ (or its single-time analogue in the canonical case) and we have to implement the constraints $\mathcal{F}'$ at the quantum level. With these modifications the loop quantisation of gravity will fully preserve its spacetime character: in the histories framework one expects that the resulting Hilbert space will carry a representation of the spacetime diffeomorphism group. The outstanding issue is whether the ensuing formalism will lead to the same results as the standard one.

# 5 Conclusions

We developed the histories description for classical gravity, described in term of the Holst Lagrangian. The basic variables at the covariant level is an $SL(2, \mathbf{C})$ connection and a field of tetrads on spacetime $M$ together with their conjugate variables. The history space $\Pi_{cov}$ that they span carries a symplectic representation of the group $Diff(M)$ of spacetime diffeomorphisms.

The next step involves the introduction of an equivariant foliation functional, implementing the translation from the spacetime theory to an one-parameter family of canonical structures. The Legendre transform of the Holst Lagrangian leads to an identification of a set of constraints, both of first- and second-class types. The construction of the metric-based theory is fully transferred into this construction and the set of constraints is invariant under the action of the diffeomorphism group. Hence, the generators of the spacetime diffeomorphism group can also be projected onto the reduced state space.

The key issue then arises, which variables should be chosen for the quantisation of the history theory. Following the spirit of loop quantum gravity, we should try to construct a loop algebra and identify a Hilbert space by studying the algebra's representation theory.

The obvious place to start would be to consider the loop algebra that corresponds to the spacetime $SL(2, \mathbf{C})$ connection of the covariant description. This however would involve developing a representation theory for loop variables with a non-compact gauge group. Moreover, we would have to identify a new role for the tetrad fields, because at this level they commute with the connection variables.

It may therefore be more profitable to work with 'internal' fields, which appear as one-parameter families of the standard canonical variables. This will have the benefit of allowing the consideration of connections with compact gauge group. Here, however a complication arises because of the gauge-dependence of the Barbero connection. We showed that is possible to implement the second-class constraints together with the primary first-class ones, thus arriving at an intermediate state space $\Pi_1$ spanned by the variables $\tilde{E}^a_i, \omega^i_a, \xi^i, {}^{\xi}\pi^i$, which were defined in Section 3.2. The remaining constraints are the Hamiltonian constraint, the three momentum constraints, the three Gauss-law constraints and the three boost gauge constraints. The analogous canonical analysis proceeds by imposing a gauge-fixing condition, which in our notation corresponds to taking $\xi^i = 0$. This allows one to get rid of the boost gauge constraints. In the resulting space, the variable $\omega^i_a$ is the $SU(2)$ Barbero connection, which remains conjugate to the triad. The remaining constraints take a simple form.

In the histories framework, however, we emphasise the general covariance of the theory: the imposition of a gauge fixing condition breaks the background independence of the theory. Hence, the spacetime diffeomorphism group does not descend to the resulting phase space. It follows therefore that a spacetime covariant loop quantisation that employs path variables should start at the very least from the space $\Pi_1$. Nonetheless, a pullback of the Barbero connection is well defined on $\Pi_1$: there exists a simple combination $A^i_a$ of the variables $\xi^i$ and $\omega^i_a$, which is (i) conjugate to the triad and (ii) behaves as an $SU(2)$ connection, with respect to the rotation gauge constraints. Hence a history quantisation of $\Pi_1$ may be envisioned, that will employ variables defined with support on a two-dimensional cylinder—giving a history analogue of the $T_0$ variables—and a three-dimensional space $S \times R$ (where $S$ is a spatial two-surface) as a history analogue of the $T_1$ variables.

However, these variables have to be implemented with additional ones that involve $\xi^i$ and its conjugate momentum. This suggests that the kinematical Hilbert space, if constructed in terms of variables with support on graphs as in the canonical loop quantum gravity programme, should involve at each point of the graph not only a representation of the $SU(2)$ group but also a mathematical object describing a unit time-like vector. This additional degree of freedom should disappear when the constraint $\mathcal{F}'$ is implemented, but there is no *a priori* guarantee that the resulting theory will be identical with the one obtained from the usual loop quantisation: it is plausible for example that the spectrum of physically relevant operators (e.g. the area operator) may develop additional degeneracies.

### Acknowledgements

I would like to thank Charis Anastopoulos for very helpful discussions, and Maria Electra Plakitsi for her inspiring contribution throughout this work. I gratefully acknowledge support from the EP/C517687 EPSRC grant. This work was partially supported by a Pythagoras I grant from the Hellenic Ministry of Education.

## References

[1] Ntina Savvidou, *General relativity histories theory I:The spacetime character of the canonical description*, Class.Quant.Grav. 21, 615 (2004).

[2] Ntina Savvidou. *General relativity histories theory II: Invariance groups*, Class.Quant.Grav. 21, 631 (2004).

[3] R. Griffiths,*Consistent Histories and the Interpretation of Quantum Mechanics*, J. Stat. Phys. 36, 219 (1984).

[4] R. Omnès, *Logical Reformulation of Quantum Mechanics: I Foundations*, J. Stat. Phys. 53, 893 (1988); *The Interpretation of Quantum Mechanics*, (Princeton University Press, Princeton, 1994); *Consistent Interpretations of Quantum Mechanics*, Rev. Mod. Phys. 64, 339 (1992).

[5] M. Gell-Mann and J. B. Hartle, *Quantum mechanics in the Light of Quantum Cosmology*, in *Complexity, Entropy and the Physics of Information*, edited by W. Zurek, (Addison Wesley, Reading, 1990); *Classical Equations for Quantum Systems*, Phys. Rev. D 47, 3345 (1993).

[6] J. B. Hartle, *Spacetime Quantum Mechanics and the Quantum Mechanics of Spacetime*, in Proceedings on the 1992 Les Houches School, Gravitation and Quantisation, 1993.

[7] C.J. Isham, *Quantum Logic and the Histories Approach to Quantum Theory*, J. Math. Phys. 35, 2157, 1994.

[8] C.J. Isham and N. Linden, *Quantum Temporal Logic and Decoherence Functionals in the Histories Approach to Generalised Quantum Theory*, J. Math. Phys. 35, 5452, 1994.

[9] K. Savvidou: *The action operator in continuous time histories*, J. Math. Phys. **40**, 5657 (1999).

[10] For review see: T. Thiemann, *Lectures on Loop Quantum Gravity*, Lect.Notes Phys. 631, 41 (2003); A. Ashtekar, *Background Independent Quantum Gravity: A Status Report*, Class.Quant.Grav. 21, R53 (2004).

[11] Barbero, J. F. *Reality Conditions and Ashtekar Variables: a Different Perspective.* Phys.Rev., **D51**: 5498, (1995).

[12] S. Holst. *Barbero's Hamiltonian derived from a generalized Hilbert-Palatini action.* Phys. Rev., **D53**: 5966, (1996).

[13] C.J.Isham and N. Linden. . (*Continuous histories and the history group in generalised quantum theory.* J. Math. Phys. 36: 5392, (1995).

[14] C. J. Isham, N. Linden, K. Savvidou and S. Schreckenberg: *Continuous Time and Consistent Histories.* J. Math. Phys. **39**, 1818 (1998).

[15] N. Barros e Sa. *Hamiltonian analysis of General relativity with the Immirzi parameter.* Int. J. Mod. Phys. D10 261, (2001).

[16] G. Immirzi. *Real and complex connections for canonical gravity.* Class. Quant. Grav. 14 L177, (1977).

[17] C. J. Isham and K. N. Savvidou, *Quantising the Foliation in History Quantum Field Theory*, J. Math. Phys 43 (2003).

[18] Samuel, J. *Is Barbero's Hamiltonian formulation a Gauge Theory of Lorentzian Gravity?.* Class. Quant. Grav. **17**, L141, (2000).

[19] Samuel, J. *Canonical Gravity, Diffeomorphisms and Objective Histories.* Class. Quant. Grav. **17**, 4645, (2000).

# A The Legendre transform

The $3+1$ decomposition of the Holst Lagrangian (3.1) is straightforward, and its expression in terms of the variables $E^I_a$, ${}^3\omega^{IJ}_a$, $\alpha^{IJ}$, $n^I$, $N$, $N_a$ can be found in the related literature [12]. Our point of departure is the substitution of the variables $\tilde{E}^a_i$, $\omega^i_a$, $\chi^i_a$, $\mu^i$, $\nu^i$, $\tilde{N}$, $N_a$, $\xi^i$, defined in Section 3.2. The substitution of these variables yields—after tedious calculations—the following form for the action

$$S = \int dt \int d^3x (\tilde{E}^a_i \dot{\omega}^i_a - \epsilon^{ijk} \tilde{E}^a_i (\chi^j_a v^k_l + \omega^j_a w^k_l) \partial_a \xi^l + \rho^i \mathcal{G}^i + \sigma_i \mathcal{F}^i + N^a \mathcal{H}_a + \tilde{N} \mathcal{H}) \quad (A.1)$$

where $\mathcal{G}^i, \mathcal{F}^i, \mathcal{H}_a, \mathcal{H}$ are given by equations (3.35-3.38). The functions $v^k_l, w^k_l$ are defined in terms of the 'boost' $\Lambda^I_J$ of Eq. (3.14) as follows

$$\begin{aligned} \Lambda^0_K \delta \Lambda^{Ki} &= v^i_l \delta \xi^l \\ \Lambda^i_K \delta \Lambda^{Kj} &= \epsilon^{ijk} w^k_l \delta \xi^l, \end{aligned} \quad (A.2)$$

where $\xi^i$ parameterises $n^I$ as $n^I = (\sqrt{1+\xi^2}, \xi^i)$. Then,

$$\begin{aligned} v^i_l &:= -\frac{1}{\sqrt{1+\xi^2}-1} (\delta^i_l - \frac{\xi^i \xi_l}{\sqrt{1+\xi^2}}) \\ w^i_l &:= \frac{1}{\sqrt{1+\xi^2}-1} \, \epsilon^i{}_{jl} \xi^j. \end{aligned} \quad (A.3)$$

Finally we perform the Legendre transform of the action (A.1). The primary constraints (3.26-3.34) are immediately determined. The secondary constraints (3.35, 3.38) are also straightforward to read. The non-trivial part is the identification of the constraint (3.30). This is obtained from the Poisson bracket of the constraint (3.27) with the Hamiltonian, since the variables $\chi^i_a$ play the role of 'Lagrange multipliers' in the action (A.1). For this purpose it is convenient to define the $3 \times 3$ matrix $\tilde{E}^{ai} \chi^j_a$ and to split it into a symmetric part $M^{ij}$ and an antisymmetric part $\epsilon^{ijk} L_k$ defined as $\tilde{E}^{ai} \chi^j_a := M^{ij} + \epsilon^{ijk} L_k$.

The antisymmetric part corresponding to $L_k$ is determined from the constraint (3.29). We then only need to vary the Hamiltonian with respect to the symmetric part $M^{ij}$. We observe that the only part of the Hamiltonian in which $M^{ij}$ appears explicitly is the Hamiltonian constraint $\mathcal{H}$. Variation of the Hamiltonian constraint yields

$$M^{kl} = U^{kl} + (1 + \beta^{-2}) \tilde{\Gamma}^{kl}, \quad (A.4)$$

where $U^{kl}$ is the symmetric part of the matrix

$$\tilde{E}^{ak} (\beta^{-1} \omega^l_a + (1 + \beta^{-2}) w^n_l \partial_a \xi^l), \quad (A.5)$$

and where

$$\tilde{\Gamma}^{kl} := \tilde{E}^a_i \tilde{E}^b_j \epsilon^{ijk} \partial_{[a} \tilde{E}^l_{b]} - \frac{1}{2} \delta^{kl} \tilde{E}^a_i \tilde{E}^b_j \epsilon^{ijm} \partial_{[a} \tilde{E}_{b]m}. \quad (A.6)$$

This constraint enables us to determine explicitly $\chi^i_a$ in terms of the remaining canonical variables

$$\chi^i_a = \beta^{-1} \omega^i_a + (1 + \beta^{-2}) \left[ \Gamma^i_a + \tilde{E}_{aj} \tilde{E}^{bi} w^j_l \partial_b \xi^l + \epsilon^{ijk} \tilde{E}^j_a \mathcal{G}^k \right]. \quad (A.7)$$

The variable $\Gamma^i_a = \tilde{E}_{ak}\tilde{\Gamma}^{ki} - \epsilon^{ijk}\tilde{E}_{aj}\partial_b\tilde{E}^{bk}$ is the unique torsionless connection corresponding to the triad $E^i_a$.

If we solve the second-class constraints and then choose the gauge condition $\xi^i = 0$—thus solving three of the gauge constraints—we find that on the constraint surface

$$\chi^i_a = \beta^{-1}\omega^i_a + (1+\beta^{-2})\Gamma^i_a. \tag{A.8}$$

The expression above allows the elimination of the $\chi^i_a$ variables from our description. As shown in Refs. [12, 15] it leads to the standard expression for the constraints in the temporal gauge.